III.   REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 has been amended and claim 2 has been cancelled. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kikinis (U.S. Patent No. 5,794,259), hereafter "Kikinis," in view of Markus et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,601), hereinafter "Markus"; and claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kikinis and Markus, and further in view of Bhatia et al. (US Publication No. 2002/0154162), hereafter "Bhatia." Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is allowable for the reasons stated below.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicants submit that the suggested combination of the cited references does not disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, "calling (701) the program component in order to store (703) the modified information data in the buffer memory [and] calling (705) the program component in order to separately upload (709) to the network server the modified information data." (Claim 1). Applicants submit that Kikinis does not disclose or suggest this feature. In this Office Action, with respect to previous claim 2 (cancelled to add the features to current claim 1) the Office asserts that "Kikinis discloses a user perusing a form for accuracy, to which corrections can be made prior to uploading the complete HTLM form to its destination (i.e. a server)". (Office Action at page 4, inner citation omitted). Applicants submit that this assertion

is not relevant to the above features because the above features claim saving and separately

uploading the <u>modified information data</u> instead of the complete HTLM form. Markus also does

not teach this feature because in Markus it is the privacy bank server, instead of a program

component, that implements the updating of modified information. In Markus, "[t]he completed

form is examined by the privacy bank server which updates its raw data repository to reflect any

changes[.]" (Col. 12, lines 17-20). Markus does not disclose or suggest that the JavaScript

program 324 saves and uploads modified information. In addition, because the privacy bank server

of Markus examines the completed form directly to update its raw data repository, Markus does not

include <u>uploading</u> the modified information. Moreover, Markus does not teach saving the

modified information in a buffer memory by a program component. As such, the suggested

combination of Kikinis and Markus does not render the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly,

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

The dependent claims are believed allowable for the same reasons stated above, as well as

for their own additional features. Applicants submit that Bhatia does not overcome the

deficiencies of Kikinis and Markus. In view of the foregoing, the Office fails to establish a *prima*

facie case of obviousness, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/1/2007

/Hunter E. Webb/
_____
Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No.: 44,593
(JZ)

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)